arXiv:1412.7845v1 [math.PR] 25 Dec 2014

A three-series theorem on Lie groups

Ming Liao[1]

Summary We obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for the convergence of independent products on Lie groups, as a natural extension of Kolmogorov's three-series theorem. Application to independent random matrices is discussed.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification 60B15.

Key words and phrases Lie groups, three-series theorem.

1 Introduction and main results

Let x_n be a sequence of independent real-valued random variables. Fix any constant $r > 0$. Kolmogorov's three-series theorem (see for example [1, Theorem 22.8]) states that the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges almost surely if and only if the following three conditions hold.

(K1) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(|x_n| > r) < \infty$;
(K2) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E(x_n 1_{[|x_n|\le r]})$ converges, where 1_A is the indicator of a set A; and
(K3) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E[(x_n 1_{[|x_n|\le r]} - b_n)^2] < \infty$, where $b_n = E(x_n 1_{[|x_n|\le r]})$.

Extensions of the three-series theorem to more general spaces have been explored in literature. In particular, Maksimov [6] obtained a one-sided extension of the three-series theorem to Lie groups, providing a set of sufficient conditions for the convergence of products of independent random variables in a Lie group, with some partial result toward the more difficult necessity part.

The purpose of this paper is to present a complete extension of the three-series theorem to a general Lie group. Our result is a simpler form of a conjecture proposed in [6], and is in more close analogy with the classical result. We not only establish the more difficult necessity part, the proof of sufficiency is also much shorter than [6]. The result will be applied to study the convergence of products of independent random matrices.

Let G be a Lie group of dimension d with identity element e. There are a relatively compact neighborhood U of e and a smooth function $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_d)$: $U \to \mathbb{R}^d$ which maps U diffeomorphically onto a convex neighborhood $\phi(U)$ of the origin 0 in $\mathbb{R}^d$, with $\phi(e) = 0$. The U is not assumed to be open and ϕ is assumed extendable to be a smooth function on an open set containing the closure $\overline{U}$ of U. In the rest of the paper, U and ϕ are fixed, but they may be chosen arbitrarily as long as the above properties are satisfied.

[1]Department of Mathematics, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849, USA. Email: liaomin@auburn.edu

Let x be a random variable in G. Its U-truncated mean b is defined by

$$\phi(b) = E[\phi(x)1_{[x\in U]}]. \tag{1}$$

Note that because $\phi(U)$ is convex, $E[\phi(x)1_{[x\in U]}] \in \phi(U)$ and $b = \phi^{-1}\{E[\phi(x)1_{[x\in U]}]\}$.

Theorem 1 *Let x_n be a sequence of independent G-valued random variables with U-truncated means b_n. Then $\hat{x}_n = x_1x_2\cdots x_n$ converges almost surely in G as $n \to \infty$ if and only if the following three conditions hold.*

(G1) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(x_n \in U^c) < \infty$, *where U^c is the complement of U in G;*
(G2) $\hat{b}_n = b_1b_2\cdots b_n$ *converges in G as $n \to \infty$; and*
(G3) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E[\|\phi(x_n)1_{[x_n\in U]} - \phi(b_n)\|^2] < \infty$, *where $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

Note that under (G1), (G3) is equivalent to $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E[\|\phi(x_n) - \phi(b_n)\|^2 1_{[x_n\in U]}] < \infty$.

The proof of Theorem 1 will begin in the next section. Note that by Kolmogorov's 0-1 law, the independent product $\hat{x}_n$ either converges almost surely or diverges almost surely.

When $G = \mathbb{R}^d$ as an additive group, one may take ϕ to be the identity map on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and U to be the ball of radius $r > 0$ centered at 0, then Theorem 1 becomes precisely Kolmogorov's three-series theorem on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

We briefly comment on the relation between the almost sure convergence and the convergence in distribution. On Euclidean spaces, it is well known that the two convergences are equivalent for a series of independent random variables. This is not true for an independent product on a Lie group G. Because if G has a compact subgroup $H \neq \{e\}$, then for any sequence of independent random variables x_n, each is distributed according to the normalized Haar measure on H, the product $x_1x_2\cdots x_n$ converge in distribution to x_1, but it is clearly not convergent almost surely. By Theorem 2.2.16 (ii) in Heyer [4], if the only compact subgroup of G is $\{e\}$, then the convergence in distribution and the almost sure convergence are equivalent for an infinite product of independent random variables in G.

For $k \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{M}_k$ be the space of $k \times k$ real matrices, which may be identified with $\mathbb{R}^d$, where $d = k^2$. The Euclidean norm of $x = \{x_{ij}\} \in \mathcal{M}_k$ is $\|x\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} x_{ij}^2}$, and it satisfies $\|xy\| \leq \|x\|\|y\|$ for $x, y \in \mathcal{M}_k$.

Let G be the group of $k \times k$ real matrices of nonzero determinants under matrix product. Its identity element e is the identity matrix I. Its Lie algebra is $\mathcal{M}_k$ with the Lie group exponential map $\exp(x)$ being the usual matrix exponential $e^x = I + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x^n/n!$.

Theorem 2 *Let G be the matrix group as above, and let x_n be a sequence of independent random variables in G. Fix $r \in (0, 1)$. Then $\hat{x}_n = x_1x_2\cdots x_n$ converges almost surely to a random matrix in G if and only if the following three conditions hold.*

(M1) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(\|x_n - I\| > r) < \infty$;
(M2) $b_1 b_2 \cdots b_n$ *converges in* G *as* $n \to \infty$, *where* $b_n = I + E[(x_n - I)1_{[\|x_n - I\| \le r]}]$; *and*
(M3) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E(\|x_n - b_n\|^2 1_{[\|x_n - I\| \le r]}) < \infty$.

Proof: For $x \in G$, let $U = \{x \in G;\ \|x - I\| \le r\}$ and $\phi(x) = x - I \in \mathcal{M}_k$. If $\|y\| < 1$, then $I+y$ is invertible with $(I+y)^{-1} = I + \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} (-1)^p y^p$. It follows that ϕ maps U diffeomorphically onto the ball of radius r centered at 0 in $\mathcal{M}_k \equiv \mathbb{R}^d$, and hence ϕ and U satisfy the required properties. Theorem 1 may be applied with b_n in (M2) being the U-truncated mean of x_n. (G1) and (G2) are just (M1) and (M2), and (G3) is $\sum_n E[\|(x_n - I)1_{H_n} - (b_n - I)\|^2] < \infty$, where $H_n = [\|x_n - I\| \le r]$. Because $E[\|(x_n - I)1_{H_n} - (b_n - I)\|^2] = E[\|x_n - b_n\|^2 1_{H_n}] + \|b_n - I\|^2 P(H_n^c)$, by (M1), (G3) is equivalent to (M3). $\square$

Example 1: Let y_n be a sequence of independent random variables in $\mathcal{M}_k \equiv \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = k^2$. Assume $x_n = I + y_n$ is almost surely invertible. Note that this holds if y_n has a continuous distribution. Also assume that for some $r \in (0, 1)$, $E(y_n 1_{[\|y_n\| \le r]}) = 0$ for all n. Then $\hat{x}_n = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n$ converges to an invertible random matrix x_∞ almost surely if

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E(\|y_n\|^2) < \infty. \tag{2}$$

To prove this claim, note that b_n in (M2) is I and (M2) holds trivially. Now (M1) is $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(\|y_n\| > r) < \infty$ and (M3) is $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E[\|y_n\|^2 1_{[\|y_n\| \le r]}] < \infty$. Because $P(\|y_n\| > r) \le E(\|y_n\|^2)/r^2$, so (M1) and (M3) are implied by (2). By Theorem 2, $\hat{x}_n$ converges almost surely in the matrix group G.

Example 2: Let y_n be independent random variables in $\mathcal{M}_k \equiv \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = k^2$. Assume y_n is normal of mean 0. Then $\hat{x}_n = (I + y_1) \cdots (I + y_n)$ converges almost surely in the matrix group G if and only if (2) holds. To prove this, note that by the symmetry of a normal distribution, $E(y_n 1_{[\|y_n\| \le r]}) = 0$ for all $r > 0$. By Example 1, (2) is a sufficient condition for the almost sure convergence of $\hat{x}_n$ in G. To see it is also necessary, it suffices to show that (2) is implied by $\sum_n E[\|y_n\|^2 1_{[\|y_n\| \le r]}] < \infty$ and $\sum_n P(\|y_n\| > r) < \infty$. This can be done by an elementary computation of the normal distribution.

Example 3: Let y_n be a sequence of independent random variables in $\mathcal{M}_k \equiv \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = k^2$. Assume there is $r > 0$, which may be chosen arbitrarily small, such that $E(y_n 1_{[\|y_n\| \le r]}) = 0$ for all n. Then $\exp(y_1) \exp(y_2) \cdots \exp(y_n)$ converges in the matrix group G almost surely if (2) holds. To prove this, apply Theorem 1 to $x_n = \exp(y_n)$ with $\phi = \exp^{-1}$ on U, where U is the diffeomorphic image of a small ball in $\mathcal{M}_k \equiv \mathbb{R}^d$ under exp. The conditions may be verified as in Example 1.

2 Sufficiency

For any sequence of independent random variables x_n in G, by the Borel-Cantelli Lemma, if (G1) holds, then almost surely, $x_n \in U$ except for finitely many n. On the other hand, if $\hat{x}_n = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n$ converges almost surely, then because $x_n = \hat{x}_{n-1}^{-1}\hat{x}_n \to e$, (G1) follows from the Borel-Cantelli Lemma. Set $x'_n = x_n$ on $[x_n \in U]$ and $x'_n = e$ on $[x_n \in U^c]$. Then the almost sure convergence of $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n$ is equivalent to that of $x'_1 x'_2 \cdots x'_n$ and (G1). Note that $\phi(x_n)1_{[x_n \in U]} = \phi(x'_n) = \phi(x'_n)1_{[x'_n \in U]}$, and all quantities in (G2) and (G3) (including b_n) only depend on the restriction of x_n on U. Therefore, (G2) and (G3) hold for x_n if and only if they hold for x'_n. Thus, as noted in [6], to prove Theorem 1, we may, and will, assume all $x_n \in U$, and prove that $\hat{x}_n$ converges almost surely in G if and only if (G2) and (G3) hold.

We will prove the sufficiency part of Theorem 1 in this section, and so assume (G2) and (G3). Let μ_n be the distribution of x_n. Because $x_n \in U$, the U-truncated mean b_n of x_n is defined by $\phi(b_n) = \mu_n(\phi)$, where $\mu_n(\phi) = \int \phi d\mu_n = E[\phi(x_n)]$. Set $\hat{x}_0 = \hat{b}_0 = e$. For $n \geq 1$, let $z_n = \hat{b}_{n-1} x_n b_n^{-1} \hat{b}_{n-1}^{-1}$ and $\hat{z}_n = z_1 z_2 \cdots z_n$, and set $\hat{z}_0 = e$. It is easy to show by a simple induction on n that for all $n \geq 0$,

$$\hat{x}_n = \hat{z}_n \hat{b}_n. \tag{3}$$

By (G2), it suffices to show that $\hat{z}_n$ converges in G almost surely.

Note that for $G = \mathbb{R}^d$, z_n is just the centered term $x_n - b_n$, and $\hat{z}_n = \hat{x}_n - \hat{b}_n$ is the sum of the centered terms. To have $\hat{x}_n = \hat{z}_n \hat{b}_n$ on a non-commutative multiplicative Lie group G, z_n has to be defined in the above rather complicated form.

By the lemma below, the almost sure convergence of $\hat{z}_n$ is equivalent to $z_m z_{m+1} \cdots z_n \to e$ almost surely as $m \to \infty$ with $m < n$.

Lemma 3 *Let u_n be independent random variables in G. Then $u_1 u_2 \cdots u_n$ converges almost surely as $n \to \infty$ if and only if $u_m u_{m+1} \cdots u_n \to e$ almost surely as $m \to \infty$ with $m < n$.*

Proof: This is an easy consequence of the existence of a complete metric on G that is invariant under left translations and is compatible with the topology on G. The metric can be any left invariant Riemannian metric on G. □

For any $f \in C_c^\infty(G)$, let $M_0 f = f(e)$ and for $n \geq 1$, let

$$M_n f = f(\hat{z}_n) - \sum_{p=1}^{n} \int [f(\hat{z}_{p-1}\hat{b}_{p-1} x b_p^{-1} \hat{b}_{p-1}^{-1}) - f(\hat{z}_{p-1})]\mu_p(dx). \tag{4}$$

Lemma 4 *Let $\mathcal{F}_n$ be the σ-algebra generated by $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$. Then $E[M_n f \mid \mathcal{F}_m] = M_m f$ for $m < n$, that is, $M_n f$ is a martingale under the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$.*

Proof: Because x_n are independent, for $m < p$,

$$E[\int f(\hat{z}_{p-1}\hat{b}_{p-1}xb_p^{-1}\hat{b}_{p-1}^{-1})\mu_p(dx) \mid \mathcal{F}_m] \;=\; E[\int f(\hat{z}_m z_{m+1}\cdots z_{p-1}\hat{b}_{p-1}xb_p^{-1}\hat{b}_{p-1}^{-1})\mu_p(dx) \mid \mathcal{F}_m]$$
$$=\; E[f(\hat{z}z_{m+1}\cdots z_{p-1}z_p)]\mid_{\hat{z}=\hat{z}_m} \;=\; E[f(\hat{z}_p) \mid \mathcal{F}_m].$$

Then $E[\int[f(\hat{z}_{p-1}\hat{b}_{p-1}xb_p^{-1}\hat{b}_{p-1}^{-1}) - f(\hat{z}_{p-1})]\mu_p(dx) \mid \mathcal{F}_m] = 0$, and $E[M_n f \mid \mathcal{F}_m] = M_m f$. $\square$

Fix an integer $m > 0$ and a neighborhood V of e. Let $f \in C_c^\infty(G)$ be such that $0 \le f \le 1$, $f(e) = 1$ and $f(x) = 0$ for $x \in V^c$. For $g \in G$, let l_g be the left translation $x \mapsto gx$ on G, and let $f_m = f \circ l_{\hat{z}_m^{-1}}$. Let $\Lambda(m, V)$ be the event that there is $n > m$ such that $z_{m+1}z_{m+2}\cdots z_n \in V^c$. To estimate $P[\Lambda(m, V)]$, let τ be the first time $n > m$ such that $z_{m+1}z_{m+2}\cdots z_n \in V^c$ and set $\tau = \infty$ if $z_{m+1}z_{m+2}\cdots z_n \in V$ for all $n > m$. Then

$$P[\Lambda(m,V)] = E\{[f_m(\hat{z}_m) - f_m(\hat{z}_\tau)]1_{\Lambda(m,V)}\} = \lim_{n\to\infty} E\{[f_m(\hat{z}_m) - f_m(\hat{z}_{\tau\wedge n})]1_{\Lambda(m,V)}\}, \quad (5)$$

where $\tau \wedge n = \min(\tau, n)$. Because $E\{[f_m(\hat{z}_m) - f_m(\hat{z}_{\tau\wedge n})]1_{\Lambda(m,V)}\} \le E[1 - f_m(\hat{z}_{\tau\wedge n})] = E[f_m(\hat{z}_m) - f_m(\hat{z}_{\tau\wedge n})]$ and $E[M_{\tau\wedge n}f_m] = E\{E[M_{\tau\wedge n}f_m \mid \mathcal{F}_m]\} = E[M_m f_m]$,

$$E\{[f_m(\hat{z}_m) - f_m(\hat{z}_{\tau\wedge n})]1_{\Lambda(m,V)}\} \;\le\; -E\{\sum_{p=m+1}^{\tau\wedge n}\int[f(\hat{z}_{p-1}\hat{b}_{p-1}xb_p^{-1}\hat{b}_{p-1}^{-1}) - f(\hat{z}_{p-1})]\mu_p(dx)\}$$
$$\le \sum_{p=m}^{\infty} E\{|\int[f(\hat{z}_{p-1}\hat{b}_{p-1}xb_p^{-1}\hat{b}_{p-1}^{-1}) - f(\hat{z}_{p-1})]\mu_p(dx)|\}. \quad (6)$$

We will write $\hat{z}, \hat{b}, b, \mu$ for $\hat{z}_{p-1}, \hat{b}_{p-1}, b_p, \mu_p$ for simplicity. For $x \in U$, by the Taylor expansion of $f(\hat{z}\hat{b}xb^{-1}\hat{b}^{-1}) = f(\hat{z}\hat{b}\phi^{-1}(\phi(x))b^{-1}\hat{b}^{-1})$ at $x = b$, noting $\mu(U^c) = 0$,

$$\int[f(\hat{z}\hat{b}xb^{-1}\hat{b}^{-1}) - f(\hat{z})]\mu(dx) = \int\{\sum_i f_i(\hat{z}, \hat{b}, b)[\phi_i(x) - \phi_i(b)]\}\mu(dx) + r, \quad (7)$$

where

$$f_i(\hat{z}, \hat{b}, b) \;=\; \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_i} f(\hat{z}\hat{b}\phi^{-1}(\phi(x))b^{-1}\hat{b}^{-1})\mid_{x=b} \quad (8)$$

and the remainder r satisfies $|r| \le c\mu(\|\phi - \phi(b)\|^2)$ for some constant $c > 0$. Because $\mu(\phi_i) = \phi_i(b)$, $\int[\phi_i(x) - \phi_i(b)]\mu(dx) = 0$, and then by (7),

$$|\int[f(\hat{z}\hat{b}xb^{-1}\hat{b}^{-1}) - f(\hat{z})]\mu(dx)| \;=\; |r| \;\le\; c\mu(\|\phi - \phi(b)\|^2). \quad (9)$$

It now follows from (5) and (6) that $P[\Lambda(m, V)] \le c\sum_{n=m}^\infty \mu_n(\|\phi - \phi(b_n)\|^2)$. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let V_k be a sequence of neighborhoods of e with $V_k \downarrow \{e\}$ as $k \uparrow \infty$. By (G3), for each $k \ge 1$, there is an integer m_k such that $P[\Lambda(m_k, V_k)] < \varepsilon^k$. Then $\sum_{k=1}^\infty P[\Lambda(m_k, V_k)] \le \sum_{k=1}^\infty \varepsilon^k = \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)$. By Lemma 3, $P(\hat{z}_n \text{ converges}) \ge P[\cap_{k=1}^\infty \Lambda(m_k, V_k)^c] \ge 1 - \sum_{k=1}^\infty P[\Lambda(m_k, V_k)] \ge 1 - \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon) \to 1$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. This proves $\hat{z}_n$ converges almost surely.

3 Necessity, part 1

We will now prove (G2) and (G3) under the assumption that $\hat{x}_n$ converges almost surely and all $x_n \in U$. This proof is more complicated and will require another section.

Because $x_n = \hat{x}_{n-1}^{-1}\hat{x}_n \to e$ almost surely, by the Borel-Cantelli Lemma,

$$\forall \text{ neighborhood } V \text{ of } e, \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(x_n \in V^c) \ < \ \infty. \tag{10}$$

We also have

$$b_n \to e \quad \text{ and } \quad \mu_n(\|\phi - \phi(b_n)\|^2) \to 0 \quad \text{ as } \ n \to \infty. \tag{11}$$

For $m < n$, let $\hat{x}_{m,n} = x_{m+1}x_{m+2}\cdots x_n$ and $\hat{b}_{m,n} = b_{m+1}b_{m+2}\cdots b_n$. If either (G2) or (G3) does not hold, then there are a neighborhood V of e, $\varepsilon > 0$ and two sequences of integers m_k and n_k with $VV \subset U$, $m_k < n_k$ and $m_k \uparrow \infty$ as $k \uparrow \infty$ such that for each $k \geq 1$,

$$\text{either } \ \textstyle\sum_{p=m_k+1}^{n_k} \mu_p(\|\phi - \phi(b_p)\|^2) \geq \varepsilon \ \text{ or } \ \hat{b}_{m_k,\,n_k} \in V^c.$$

Because of (11), by choosing m_1 large enough, we have $b_n \in V$ and $\mu_n(\|\phi - \phi(b_n)\|^2) \leq \varepsilon$ for $n > m_1$. Thus, by suitably reducing n_k, we obtain that for each $k \geq 1$, either

(i) $\varepsilon \leq \sum_{p=m_k+1}^{n_k} \mu_p(\|\phi - \phi(b_p)\|^2) \leq 2\varepsilon$, and $\hat{b}_{m_k,p} \in U$ for $m_k < p \leq n_k$; or
(ii) $\sum_{p=m_k+1}^{n_k} \mu_p(\|\phi - \phi(b_p)\|^2) \leq 2\varepsilon$, $\hat{b}_{m_k,n_k} \in V^c$, and $\hat{b}_{m_k,p} \in U$ for $m_k < p \leq n_k$.

We will derive a contradiction from either (i) or (ii) above. We will embed the partial products $x_{m_k,p}$ and $b_{m_k,p}$, for $m_k < p \leq n_k$, into a process $\tilde{x}_t^k$ and a function $\tilde{b}_t^k$ on [0, 1] respectively. The main idea is to obtain a martingale property for the process $\tilde{z}_t^k$, defined by $\tilde{x}_t^k = \tilde{z}_t^k\tilde{b}_t^k$, similar to the martingale property for $\hat{z}_n$ in the last section, to show the limit $\tilde{z}_t$ of $\tilde{z}_t^k$ satisfies an integral equation, and then to derive a contradiction. This is similar to the approaches in [3, 5] for processes in Lie groups with independent increments.

Let γ_k be a strictly increasing function from $\{m_k, m_k+1, \ldots, n_k\}$ into [0, 1] with $\gamma_k(m_k) = 0$ and $\gamma_k(n_k) = 1$. Let $t_{k,p} = \gamma_k(p)$ for $m_k \leq p \leq n_k$. Then $t_{k,m_k} = 0$ and $t_{k,n_k} = 1$. Let $\tilde{x}_t^k = \tilde{b}_t^k = e$ for $0 \leq t < t_{k,\,m_k+1}$. For $m_k < p < n_k$ and $t_{k,p} \leq t < t_{k,\,p+1}$, let

$$\tilde{x}_t^k = \hat{x}_{m_k,p} \quad \text{ and } \quad \tilde{b}_t^k = \hat{b}_{m_k,p}. \tag{12}$$

Set $\tilde{x}_t^k = \hat{x}_{m_k,\,n_k}$ and $\tilde{b}_t^k = \hat{b}_{m_k,\,n_k}$ for $t \geq 1$. Then $\tilde{x}_t^k$ and $\tilde{b}_t^k$ are respectively a step process and a step function, which are right continuous with jumps x_p and b_p at $t = t_{k,p}$.

Note that by Lemma 3, almost surely, $\tilde{x}_t^k \to e$ as $k \to \infty$ uniformly in t.

A continuous function $A(t) = \{A_{ij}(t)\}$ from $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$ to the space of $d \times d$ symmetric real matrices is called a covariance matrix function if $A(0) = 0$ and for $s < t$, $A(t) - A(s) \geq 0$

(nonnegative definite). Let

$$A_{ij}^k(t) = \sum_{0<t_{k,p}\le t} \int_G [\phi_i(x) - \phi_i(b_p)][\phi_j(x) - \phi_j(b_p)]\mu_p(dx). \tag{13}$$

Then $A^k(t) = \{A_{ij}^k(t)\}$ is almost a covariance matrix function except that it is not continuous, but $A^k(t) = A^k(1)$ for $t \ge 1$. Let $Q^k(t)$ be the trace of $A^k(t)$. Then

$$Q^k(t) = \sum_{0<t_{k,p}\le t} \mu_p(\|\phi - \phi(b_p)\|^2), \tag{14}$$

and for $s < t$,

$$|A_{ij}^k(t) - A_{ij}^k(s)| \ \le \ Q^k(t) - Q^k(s). \tag{15}$$

Note that $Q^k(t)$ is a nondecreasing step function in t with a jump $\mu_p(\|\phi-\phi(b_p)\|^2)$ at $t = t_{k,p}$, $Q^k(t) = 0$ for $0 \le t < t_{m_k,\, m_k+1}$ and $Q^k(t) = Q^k(1) = \sum_{m_k<p\le n_k} \mu_p(\|\phi - \phi(b_p)\|^2)$ for $t \ge 1$. By either (i) or (ii), $Q^k(t) \le 2\varepsilon$, and by (11), the jumps of $Q^k(t)$ converge to 0 uniformly in t as $k \to \infty$. It follows that the function γ_k may be chosen properly such that

$$Q^k(t) - Q^k(s) \ \le \ 2\varepsilon(t-s) + \varepsilon_k, \quad 0 \le s < t \le 1, \tag{16}$$

where $\varepsilon_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Roughly speaking, this means the functions $Q^k(t)$ are equicontinuous for large k. Because of (11), by either (i) or (ii), $n_k - m_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$, and hence γ_k may be chosen to satisfy, besides (16),

$$\max_{p>m_k+1}(t_{k,p} - t_{k,\,p-1}) \ \to \ 0 \quad \text{as} \ \ k \to \infty. \tag{17}$$

Lemma 5 *There is a covariance matrix function $A(t)$ with $A(t) = A(1)$ for $t \ge 1$ such that along a subsequence of $k \to \infty$, $A^k(t) \to A(t)$ for any $t \ge 0$.*

Proof Let Λ be a countable dense subset of [0, 1]. Under either (i) or (ii), $Q^k(t)$ is bounded. By (15), along a subsequence of $k \to \infty$, $A^k(t)$ converges for any $t \in \Lambda$. By (16), the convergence holds for all $t \ge 0$, and $A(t)$ is continuous in t. □

Let Y be a smooth manifold equipped with a compatible metric ρ and let y: $[0, 1] \to Y$ be a continuous function. For each k, let y^k: $[0, 1] \to Y$ be a step function that is constant on $[t_{k,\,p-1},\, t_{k,p})$ for each $p = m_k + 1, \ldots, n_k$. Assume for any $t > 0$, $\rho(y^k(t_{k,p}), y(t_{k,p})) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ uniformly for $t_{k,p} \le t$. Let $F(y, g) = \{F_{ij}(y, g)\}$ be a bounded continuous matrix-valued function on $Y \times G$.

Lemma 6 *Assume the above and let $A(t)$ be the covariance matrix function in Lemma 5. Then for any $t > 0$, along the subsequence of $k \to \infty$ in Lemma 5,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{0<t_{k,p}\le t} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \int_G F_{ij}(y^k(t_{k,\,p-1}), b_p)[\phi_i(x) - \phi_i(b_p)][\phi_j(x) - \phi_j(b_p)]\mu_p(dx) \\ \to \ &\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \int_0^t F_{ij}(y(s), e)dA_{ij}(s). \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Proof By the uniform convergence $\rho(y^k(t_{k,p}), y(t_{k,p})) \to 0$, $F(y^k(t_{k,p}), b) - F(y(t_{k,p}), b) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ uniformly for $t_{k,p} \le t$ and for b in a compact set. Because when $k \to \infty$, $b_p \to e$ uniformly for $p > m_k$, we may replace y^k and b_p by y and e in the proof.

Let $r > 0$ be an integer. For any two expressions A and B depending on (k, r), we will write $A \approx B$ if $|A - B| \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$ uniformly in k. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{0<t_{k,p}\le t} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \int_G F_{ij}(y(t_{k,\,p-1}), e)[\phi_i(x) - \phi_i(b_p)][\phi_j(x) - \phi_j(b_p)]\mu_p(dx) \\
\approx & \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \sum_{q=0}^{r-1} \sum_{qt/r<t_{k,p}\le(q+1)t/r} \int_G F_{ij}(y(\frac{qt}{r}), e)[\phi_i(x) - \phi_i(b_p)][\phi_j(x) - \phi_j(b_p)]\mu_p(dx) \\
& (\text{where } \textstyle\sum_{qt/r<t_{k,p}\le(q+1)t/r}(\cdots) = 0 \text{ if } (\frac{qt}{r}, \frac{(q+1)t}{t}] \text{ contains no } t_{k,p}) \\
\to & \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \sum_{q=0}^{r-1} F_{ij}(y(\frac{qt}{r}), e)[A_{ij}(\frac{(q+1)t}{r}) - A_{ij}(\frac{qt}{r})] \quad (\text{as } k \to \infty, \text{ by Lemma 5}) \\
\approx & \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \int_0^t F_{ij}(y(s), e) dA_{ij}(s). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

We now define a new process $\tilde{z}_t^k$, similar in the way as the sequence z_n is defined from x_n and b_n in §2, by setting $\tilde{z}_t^k = e$ for $0 \le t < t_{k,\,m_k+1}$, and inductively

$$\tilde{z}_t^k \;=\; \tilde{z}_{t_{k,\,p-1}}^k \tilde{b}_{t_{k,\,p-1}}^k x_p b_p^{-1} (\tilde{b}_{t_{k,\,p-1}}^k)^{-1} \tag{19}$$

for $t_{k,p} \le t < t_{k,p+1}$, $p = m_k + 1, \ldots, n_k$, setting $t_{k,\,n_k+1} = \infty$ here. Then $\tilde{z}_t = \tilde{z}_1$ for $t > 1$, and a simple induction on p shows that $\tilde{x}_t^k = \tilde{z}_t^k \tilde{b}_t^k$ for all $t \ge 0$.

For $f \in C_c^\infty(G)$, let $\tilde{M}_t^k f = f(\tilde{z}_t^k) = f(e)$ for $0 \le t < t_{k,\,m_k+1}$, and let

$$\tilde{M}_t^k f \;=\; f(\tilde{z}_t^k) - \sum_{0<t_{k,p}\le t} \int_G [f(\tilde{z}_{t_{k,\,p-1}}^k \tilde{b}_{t_{k,\,p-1}}^k x b_p^{-1} (\tilde{b}_{t_{k,\,p-1}}^k)^{-1}) - f(\tilde{z}_{t_{k,\,p-1}})]\mu_p(dx), \tag{20}$$

for $t \ge t_{k,\,m_k+1}$.

Lemma 7 *$\tilde{M}_t^k f$ is a martingale under the natural filtration of process $\tilde{z}_t^k$.*

Proof: This is proved in the same way as in Lemma 4 for $M_n f$ to be a martingale. $\square$

Because $\tilde{x}_t^k = \tilde{z}_t^k \tilde{b}_t^k$ and $\tilde{x}_t^k \to e$ uniformly in t as $k \to \infty$ almost surely, if $\tilde{b}_t^k$ converges to some continuous path $\tilde{b}_t$ in G uniformly in t as $k \to \infty$, then $\tilde{z}_t^k \to \tilde{z}_t = \tilde{b}_t^{-1}$ uniformly in t almost surely. This will be assumed in the rest of this section.

By a computation using Taylor expansion similar to the one in the last section, but up to the second order, noting the integrals of the first order terms vanish as before,

$$\tilde{M}_t^k f \;=\; f(\tilde{z}_t^k) - \sum_{0<t_{k,p}\le t} \sum_{i,j} \int_G f_{ij}(\tilde{z}_{t_{k,\,p-1}}^k, \tilde{b}_{t_{k,\,p-1}}^k, b_p)[\phi_i(x) - \phi_i(b_p)][\phi_j(x) - \phi_p(b_p)]\mu_p(dx) + r_k,$$

where

$$f_{ij}(\tilde{z},\tilde{b},b) \;=\; \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\phi_i\partial\phi_j} f(\tilde{z}\tilde{b}\phi^{-1}(\phi(x))b^{-1}\tilde{b}^{-1}) \mid_{x=b},$$

and the reminder r_k may be divided into an integral over a small neighborhood V of e and an integral over V^c. The former is controlled by $c_V Q^k(t) \le c_V(2\varepsilon)$, where the constant $c_V \to 0$ as $V \downarrow \{e\}$, and the latter is controlled by $\sum_{m_k<p\le n_k} \mu_p(V^c)$ which converges to 0 as $k \to \infty$ by (10). Therefore, $r_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. By Lemma 6 with $Y = G \times G$ and $y^k(t) = (\tilde{z}_t^k, \tilde{b}_t^k) \to y(t) = (\tilde{z}_t, \tilde{b}_t)$, it follows that $\tilde{M}_t^k f$ converges to the martingale

$$\tilde{M}_t f = f(\tilde{z}_t) - \sum_{i,j} \int_0^t f_{ij}(\tilde{z}_s, \tilde{b}_s, e) dA_{ij}(s)$$

as $k \to \infty$. Because $\tilde{z}_t = \tilde{b}_t^{-1}$ is non-random, the martingale $\tilde{M}_t f$ must be $f(e)$, and then for any $f \in C_c^\infty(G)$ with $f(e) = 0$,

$$f(\tilde{z}_t) \;=\; \sum_{i,j} \int_0^t [\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\phi_i\,\partial\phi_j} f(\phi^{-1}(\phi(x))\tilde{z}_s) \mid_{x=e}] dA_{ij}(s). \tag{21}$$

Let t_0 be the largest nonnegative real number ≤ 1 such that $\tilde{z}_s = e$ and $A(s) = 0$ for $s \le t_0$. We will show $t_0 = 1$. Suppose $t_0 < 1$. Then (21) holds for $t \ge t_0$ with $\int_0^t$ replaced by $\int_{t_0}^t$. Without loss of generality, we will assume $t_0 = 0$. Substitute $f = \phi_\beta^2$ in (21), then the integrand is $2\delta_{i\beta}\delta_{j\beta} + \varepsilon_s$, where ε_s denotes any function satisfying $\varepsilon_s \to 0$ as $s \to 0$. It follows that $\phi_\beta(\tilde{z}_t)^2 = 2A_{\beta\beta}(t) + \varepsilon_t T_t$, where $T_t = \mathrm{Tr}[A(t)]$. Then $\|\phi(\tilde{z}_t)\|^2 = 2T_t + \varepsilon_t T_t$. Now let $f = \phi_\beta$ and then (21) yields $\phi_\beta(\tilde{z}_t) = \varepsilon_t T_t$. This implies $|\phi_\beta(\tilde{z}_t)| \le c\|\phi(\tilde{z}_t)\|^2$ for some constant $c > 0$, which is clearly impossible. This shows that $t_0 = 1$, and hence $\tilde{z}_t = e$ and $A(t) = 0$ for all $t \ge 0$.

If (i) holds, then $\mathrm{Tr}[A(1)] = \lim_k Q^k(1) = \lim_k \sum_{p=m_k+1}^{n_k} \mu_p(\|\phi - \phi(b_p)\|^2) \ge \varepsilon$, which contradicts to $A(t) = 0$. Thus (i) cannot hold. If (ii) holds, then $\tilde{b}_1 = \lim_k \tilde{b}_1^k = \lim_k \hat{b}_{m_k,n_k}$ belongs to the closure of V^c, which contradicts to $\tilde{b}_t = \tilde{z}_t^{-1} = e$. We have proved that neither (i) nor (ii) holds, and hence (G2) and (G3) must hold, under the assumption that $\tilde{b}_t^k \to \tilde{b}_t$ as $k \to \infty$ uniformly in t for some continuous path $\tilde{b}_t$ in G.

4 Necessity, part 2

It remains to show that $\tilde{b}_t^k \to \tilde{b}_t$ as $k \to \infty$ uniformly in t for some continuous path $\tilde{b}_t$ in G. A rcll path is a right continuous path with left limits, and a process with rcll paths will be called a rcll process. Let $D(G)$ be the space of rcll paths in G. Equipped with the Skorohod metric, $D(G)$ is a complete separable metric space (see [2, chapter 3]). A sequence of rcll processes y_t^k in G are said to converge weakly to a rcll process y_t if $y_\cdot^k \to y_\cdot$ in distribution

as $D(G)$-valued random variables. The sequence y_t^k are called relatively weak compact in $D(G)$ if any subsequence has a further subsequence that converge weakly.

We will show that $\tilde{z}_t^k$ are relatively weak compact. Let V be a neighborhood of e. The amount of time it takes for a rcll process y_t to make V^c-displacement from a stopping time σ (under the natural filtration of process y_t) is denoted as τ_V^σ, that is,

$$\tau_V^\sigma = \inf\{t > 0; \quad y_\sigma^{-1} y_{\sigma+t} \in V^c\} \quad \text{(inf of an empty set is } \infty). \tag{22}$$

For a sequence of processes y_t^k in G, let $\tau_V^{\sigma,k}$ be the V^c-displacement time for y_t^k from σ.

The following lemma is Lemma 16 in [5] and provides a criterion for the relative compactness. It is a slightly improved version of a lemma in [3].

Lemma 8 *A sequence of rcll processes y_t^k in G are relatively weak compact in $D(G)$ if for any constant $T > 0$ and any neighborhood V of e,*

$$\overline{\lim_{k\to\infty}} \sup_{\sigma \le T} P(\tau_V^{\sigma,k} < \delta) \ \to \ 0 \ \text{ as } \delta \to 0, \tag{23}$$

and

$$\overline{\lim_{k\to\infty}} \sup_{\sigma \le T} P[(y_{\sigma-}^k)^{-1} y_\sigma^k \in K^c] \ \to \ 0 \ \text{ as compact } K \uparrow G, \tag{24}$$

where $\sup_{\sigma\le T}$ is taken over all stopping times $\sigma \le T$.

We will apply Lemma 8 to $y_t^k = \tilde{z}_t^k$. Because $\tilde{z}_t^k = \tilde{z}_1^k$ for $t > 1$, we may take $T = 1$ in Lemma 8. Let $f \in C_c^\infty(G)$ be such that $0 \le f \le 1$ on G, $f(e) = 1$ and $f = 0$ on V^c. For any stopping time $\sigma \le 1$, write τ for $\tau_V^{\sigma,k}$ and let $f_\sigma = f \circ l_z$ with $z = (\tilde{z}_\sigma^k)^{-1}$. Then

$$P(\tau < \delta) = E[f_\sigma(\tilde{z}_\sigma^k) - f_\sigma(\tilde{z}_{\sigma+\tau}^k); \tau < \delta] \le E[f_\sigma(\tilde{z}_\sigma^k) - f_\sigma(\tilde{z}_{\sigma+\tau\wedge\delta}^k)], \tag{25}$$

noting $f_\sigma(z_\sigma^k) = 1$, $f_\sigma(z_{\sigma+\tau}^k) = 0$ and $\tau = \tau \wedge \delta$ on $[\tau < \delta]$. Because $\tilde{M}_t^k f$ given by (20) is a martingale for any $f \in C_c^\infty(G)$, and σ and $\sigma + \tau \wedge \delta$ are stopping times,

$$E[\tilde{M}_\sigma^k f_\sigma - \tilde{M}_{\sigma+\tau\wedge\delta}^k f_\sigma] = E\{E[\tilde{M}_\sigma^k f_\sigma - \tilde{M}_{\sigma+\tau\wedge\delta}^k f_\sigma \mid \mathcal{F}_\sigma]\} = 0.$$

Writing $\tilde{z}, \tilde{b}, b, \mu$ for $\tilde{z}_{t_{k,\,p-1}}^k, \tilde{b}_{t_{k,\,p-1}}^k, b_p, \mu_p$, by (20) and (25), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P(\tau < \delta) \ &\le \ -E\{\sum_{\sigma < t_{k,p} \le \sigma+\tau\wedge\delta} \int_G [f_\sigma(\tilde{z}\tilde{b}xb^{-1}\tilde{b}^{-1}) - f_\sigma(\tilde{z})]\mu(dx)\} \\ &\le \ E\{\sum_{\sigma < t_{k,p} \le \sigma+\delta} |\int_G [f_\sigma(\tilde{z}\tilde{b}xb^{-1}\tilde{b}^{-1}) - f_\sigma(\tilde{z})]\mu(dx)|\}. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Performing the same computation leading to (9) shows that for some constant $c > 0$,

$$P(\tau < \delta) \ \le \ cE[Q^k(\sigma + \delta) - Q^k(\sigma)].$$

By (16), $E[Q^k(\sigma+\delta)-Q^k(\sigma)] \le 2\varepsilon\delta+\varepsilon_k$. It follows that $\overline{\lim}_{k\to\infty}\sup_{\sigma\le 1} P(\tau<\delta) \le 2c\varepsilon\delta$. This shows that the condition (23) is satisfied for $y_t^k = \tilde{z}_t^k$.

To verify (24), note that because $\tilde{x}_t^k = \tilde{z}_t^k\tilde{b}_t^k$,

$$P[(\tilde{z}_{\sigma-}^k)^{-1}\tilde{z}_\sigma^k \in K^c] = P[(\tilde{x}_{\sigma-}^k)^{-1}\tilde{x}_\sigma^k \in (\tilde{b}_{\sigma-}^k)^{-1}K^c\tilde{b}_\sigma^k].$$

By either (i) or (ii), $\tilde{b}_t^k$ are bounded in k, when K is large, $(\tilde{b}_{\sigma-}^k)^{-1}K\tilde{b}_\sigma^k$ contains a fixed neighborhood H of e. Because $(\tilde{b}_{\sigma-}^k)^{-1}K^c\tilde{b}_\sigma^k = ((\tilde{b}_{\sigma-}^k)^{-1}K\tilde{b}_\sigma^k)^c$, it follows that

$$P[(\tilde{z}_{\sigma-}^k)^{-1}\tilde{z}_\sigma^k \in K^c] \;\le\; P[(\tilde{x}_{\sigma-}^k)^{-1}\tilde{x}_\sigma^k \in H^c] \;\le\; \sum_{p>m_k}\mu_p(H^c) \to 0$$

as $k\to\infty$. This verifies (24) even before taking $K\uparrow G$.

By Lemma 8, $\tilde{z}_t^k$ are relatively weak compact, and hence along a subsequence of $k\to\infty$, $\tilde{z}_t^k$ converge weakly to a rcll process $\tilde{z}_t$ in G. As $D(G)$-valued random variables, $\tilde{z}_\cdot^k$ converge in distribution to $\tilde{z}_\cdot$. It is well known (see for example Theorem 1.8 in [2, chapter 3]) that there are $D(G)$-valued random variables $\tilde{z}_\cdot'^k$ and $\tilde{z}_\cdot'$, possibly on a different probability space, such that $\tilde{z}_\cdot'$ is equal to $\tilde{z}_\cdot$ in distribution, $\tilde{z}_\cdot'^k$ is equal to $\tilde{z}_\cdot^k$ in distribution for each k, and $\tilde{z}_\cdot'^k \to \tilde{z}_\cdot'$ almost surely. Because $\tilde{x}_\cdot^k = \tilde{z}_\cdot^k\tilde{b}_\cdot^k \to e$ almost surely, where e is regarded as a constant path in G, $\tilde{x}_\cdot'^k = \tilde{z}_\cdot'^k\tilde{b}_\cdot^k \to e$ in distribution. As the limit e is non-random, $\tilde{x}_\cdot'^k \to e$ in probability. Then along a further subsequence of $k\to\infty$, $\tilde{x}_\cdot'^k \to e$ almost surely, and hence $\tilde{b}_\cdot^k = (\tilde{z}_\cdot'^k)^{-1}\tilde{x}_\cdot'^k \to (\tilde{z}_\cdot')^{-1}$.

The convergence $\tilde{b}_t^k \to \tilde{b}_t = (\tilde{z}_t')^{-1}$ under the Skorohod metric means (see Proposition 5.3(c) in [2, chapter 3]) that there are continuous strictly increasing functions λ_k: $\mathbb{R}_+\to\mathbb{R}_+$ such that as $k\to\infty$, $\lambda_k(t)-t\to 0$ and $r(\tilde{b}_t^k, \tilde{b}_{\lambda_k(t)})\to 0$ uniformly for $0\le t\le 1$, where r is a compatible metric on G. If $\tilde{b}_t$ has a jump of size $r(\tilde{b}_{s-},\tilde{b}_s)>0$ at time s, then $\tilde{b}_t^k$ would have a jump of size close to $r(\tilde{b}_{s-}^\gamma,\tilde{b}_s)$ at time $t=\lambda_k^{-1}(s)$, which is impossible because the jumps of $\tilde{b}_t^k$ are uniformly small when k is large. It follows that $\tilde{b}_t$ is continuous in t and hence $\tilde{b}_t^k\to\tilde{b}_t$ uniformly in t as $k\to\infty$.

Acknowledgement: The author wishes to thank David Applebaum and an anonymous referee for some very helpful comments.

References

[1] Billingsley, P. "Probability and measure", second edition, Wiley (1986).

[2] Ethier, S.N. and Kurtz, T.G., "Markov processes, characterization and convergence", John Wiley (1986).

[3] Feinsilver, P., "Processes with independent increments on a Lie group", Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 242, (1978), 73-121.

[4] Heyer, H., "Probability measures on locally compact groups", Springer (1977).

[5] Liao, M., "Inhomogeneous Lévy processes in Lie groups and homogeneous spaces", J. Theor. Probab. 27, (2014), 315-357.

[6] Maksimov, V.M., "The principle of convergence "almost everywhere" in Lie groups", Math. USSR Sbornik 20, (1973), 543-555.